

Robust Dropping Criteria for F-norm Minimization Based Sparse Approximate Inverse Preconditioning*

Zhongxiao Jia[†]

Qian Zhang[‡]

Abstract

Dropping tolerance criteria play a central role in *adaptive* and *static* F-norm minimization based Sparse Approximate Inverse (SAI) preconditioning and Factorized SAI (FSAI) preconditioning. However, such criteria have received little attention and have been treated heuristically in such a way: If the size of an entry is below some empirically small quantity, then it is set as zero. The meaning of “small” is vague and loose and has not been considered rigorously and precisely. It has not been clear how dropping tolerances affect the quality and effectiveness of a preconditioner M . In this paper, we focus on the adaptive Power Sparse Approximate Inverse (PSAI) algorithm proposed by Jia and Zhu (Numer. Linear Algebra Appl., 16 (2009): 259–299) and establish a solid theory on robust selection criteria for it. Using the theory, one can select dropping criteria to guarantee the non-singularity of M and make it as sparse as possible and in the meantime can make M have comparable quality to the possibly much denser one obtained by PSAI without dropping. The theory is adapted to all the static F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning procedures. Numerical experiments are reported to confirm the theory and illustrate the robustness and effectiveness of selection criteria for dropping tolerances.

Keywords. Preconditioning; preconditioner; sparse approximate inverse; PSAI; selection criteria; dropping tolerance; F-norm minimization; adaptive; static.

AMS Subject Classification (2000). 65F10

1 Introduction

Preconditioned Krylov subspace methods [32] are among the most popular iterative solvers for the large sparse linear system of equations

$$Ax = b, \tag{1}$$

where A is a nonsingular and nonsymmetric (non-Hermitian) $n \times n$ matrix and b is an n -dimensional vector. Sparse approximate inverse (SAI) preconditioning is one class of important general-purpose preconditioning for Krylov solvers, which aims to construct sparse approximations of A^{-1} directly. There are two typical kinds of SAI preconditioning

*Supported by National Basic Research Program of China 2011CB302400 and the National Science Foundation of China (No. 11071140).

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China, jiazx@tsinghua.edu.cn.

[‡]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China, qianzhang.thu@gmail.com.

approaches. One of them is to construct factorized sparse approximate inverses. An effective algorithm of this kind is the approximate inverse (AINV) algorithm, which is derived from the incomplete (bi)conjugation procedure [4, 5]. The other kind is based on F-norm minimization and is inherently parallelizable. It aims to construct a SAI $M \approx A^{-1}$ by minimizing $\|AM - I\|_F$ for a specified pattern of M that is either prescribed in advance or determined adaptively, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the F-norm of a matrix. A hybrid version of the two kinds, i.e., the factorized approximate inverse (FSAI) preconditioning based on F-norm minimization, has been introduced by Kolotilina and Yeremin[29], who have proposed an FSAI algorithm. FSAI is then generalized to block form and called BFSAI in [23]. An adaptive algorithm in [24] is presented that generates automatically the nonzero pattern of the BFSAI preconditioner. In addition, the idea of F-norm minimization is generalized in [21] by introducing a sparse readily inverted *target* matrix T . M is then computed by minimizing $\|AM - T\|_{F,H}$ over a space of matrices with a prescribed sparsity pattern, where $\|\cdot\|_{F,H}$ is the generalized F-norm defined by $\|B\|_{F,H}^2 = \langle B, B \rangle_{F,H} = \text{trace}(B^T H B)$, where H is some symmetric (Hermitian) positive definite matrix and the superscript T denotes the transpose of a matrix or vector and it is replaced by the conjugate transpose if the matrix B is complex. A good comparison of factorized SAI and F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning approaches can be found in [6]. Incomplete factorizations and SAIs have been shown to provide effective smoothers for multigrid; see, e.g., [10, 11, 34, 36]. For a comprehensive survey on preconditioning techniques, we refer the reader to [3].

In this paper, we focus on F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning, where a central issue is to determine the sparsity pattern of M effectively. There has been much work on a-priori pattern prescriptions, see, e.g., [2, 12, 13, 22, 33]. Once the pattern of M or its envelop is given, the computation of M is straightforward by solving n independent least squares (LS) problems and M is then further sparsified generally. This is called a static SAI preconditioning procedure. Huckle [22] has compared different a-priori sparsity patterns and established effective upper bounds for the sparsity pattern of M obtained by the famous adaptive SPAI algorithm [19]. He shows that the patterns of $(A^T A)^k A^T$, $(I + |A| + |A^T|)^k A^T$ and $(I + A)^k$ for small k can be good envelop patterns of a good M . These predictions are very useful to reduce the communication time by distributing data of A to processors a-priori to compute M in a distributed parallel environment.

For a general sparse matrix A , however, determining an effective sparsity pattern of A^{-1} is nontrivial. A-priori patterns may not capture positions of large entries in A^{-1} effectively when they are sparse. Or, they may capture the positions only when the patterns are quite and even unacceptably dense, so that the storage becomes a bottleneck and the construction of M 's is impractically time consuming. To cope with this difficulty, a number of researchers have proposed adaptive strategies that start from a simple initial pattern and successively augment or adaptively adjust this pattern until M is satisfied with certain accuracy, i.e., $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon$ for some norm $\|\cdot\|$, where a given ε is fairly small, or a maximum number of nonzero entries in M is reached. This idea was first proposed by Cosgrove *et al.* [16] and developed by Grote and Huckle [19], by Gould and Scott [18] and by Chow and Saad [15]. It appears that the SPAI preconditioning proposed by Grote and Huckle [19] is more robust than the others [3]. One of the key differences between these procedures is that they use different adaptive ways to generate sparsity patterns of M 's. They all need to drop small entries to get sparse M 's. Recently, Jia and Zhu [25] have proposed a Power Sparse Approximate Inverse (PSAI) procedure that determines the sparsity pattern of M in a new adaptive way. Furthermore, they have developed a practical PSAI algorithm with dropping, called PSAI(*tol*), that dynamically

drops the entries in M whose magnitudes are smaller than a prescribed tolerance tol during the process. They have conducted extensive numerical experiments, demonstrating that the $PSAI(tol)$ algorithm is at least comparable to and for some real-world problems is considerably more effective than the SPAI algorithm [19].

As we have seen, one generally has to use dropping strategies to make M sparse so as to reduce the construction or/and application cost of M when it is determined statically or dynamically. Apparently, dropping is a key step and plays a central role in designing a robust and effective SAI preconditioning procedure. Chow [13] suggests a prefiltration strategy and drops the entries of A itself that are below some tolerance before determining the pattern of M . This prefiltration idea is also adopted in, e.g., [26, 27, 33]. Instead of prefiltration, it may be more effective to apply the sparsification to M after it has been computed, which is called postfiltration; see, e.g., [12, 34]. Wang and Zhang [35] have proposed a multistep static SAI preconditioning procedure that uses both prefiltration and postfiltration. Obviously, for a static SAI procedure, postfiltration cannot reduce the construction cost of M ; rather, it only reduces the application cost of M at each iteration. For an adaptive SAI procedure, a more effective approach is to dynamically drop small entries immediately once they are generated as the construction process proceeds. This approach is more appealing as it makes M 's sparse throughout the whole construction process and may save the computational cost of M very considerably. For sparsification applied to FSAI, we refer the reader to [8, 7, 17, 28].

In this paper, we are concerned with dropping tolerance strategies applied to the adaptive PSAI procedure and all the static F-norm minimization based SAI procedures. We have noticed that the dropping tolerances used in the literature are heuristic and empirical. One simply takes some small quantities, say like 10^{-3} , as dropping tolerances. Nevertheless, the mechanism for dropping tolerances is by no means so simple. Empirically chosen tolerances are not robust and may be at risk, and they are prone to the ineffectiveness and even failure of preconditioning. Obviously, an improperly chosen big tolerance may produce a sparser but less ineffective M ; on the other hand, a too small tolerance may result in a possibly much denser M that is much more time consuming to construct or/and apply though it may be a good approximate inverse. Our experiments will confirm these and illustrate that simply taking seemingly small quantities as dropping tolerance, as done in the literature, may produce (numerically) singular M 's, causing Krylov solvers to fail completely. Therefore, selection criteria for dropping tolerances deserve enough attention and it is definitely desirable to establish a rigorous mathematical theory that can reveal intrinsic relationships between the tolerances and the quality and effectiveness of M , enabling us to design robust and effective SAI preconditioning procedures.

We point out that dropping has been extensively used in other important preconditioning techniques such as ILU factorizations [14, 31]. Some effective selection criteria have been proposed for dropping tolerances in, e.g., [9, 20, 30].

The goal of this paper is to make an in-depth analysis of selection criteria for dropping tolerances used in PSAI. We will establish a rigorous and solid theory on it. We prove that the non-singularity and quality of M obtained by PSAI strongly depends on dropping tolerances and can be very sensitive to them. Using our theory, one can select dropping tolerances to guarantee the non-singularity of M and make it as sparse as possible and in the meantime can make M have a similar quality as an approximate inverse to the possibly much denser one obtained by PSAI without dropping. Our theory on the selection criteria for dropping tolerances is easily adapted to all the static F-norm minimization based SAI procedures. The new criteria can be applied to run postfiltration reliably and robustly for

M obtained by a static SAI procedure, making M and its sparsification have comparable preconditioning quality. We make numerical experiments to illustrate our theory and show that the quality and effectiveness of M critically depends on and can be sensitive to dropping tolerances. Particularly, we report the examples that demonstrate that (i) smaller tolerances are not necessary since they either make M possibly much denser or cannot drop more entries and meanwhile make its construction more time consuming but no essential improvements on the quality of M and (ii) larger but seemingly small tolerances can produce (numerically) singular M 's, making preconditioning fail completely.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the basic PSAI (BPSAI) procedure and the PSAI(tol) procedure with dropping [25]. In Section 3, we present a few results and based on them establish robust selection criteria for dropping tolerances. In Section 4, we test PSAI(tol) on a wide range of real world problems, justifying our theory and illustrating robustness and effectiveness of our selection criteria for dropping tolerances. We also test the three static F-norm minimization based SAI procedures with the patterns of $(I + A)^k$, $(I + |A| + |A^T|)^k$ and $(A^T A)^k A^T$ for a given small integer k and illustrate the effectiveness of our selection criteria for dropping tolerances. Finally, we end up the paper with some concluding remarks in Section 5.

2 PSAI algorithms

The BPSAI procedure is based on F-norm minimization and determines the sparsity pattern of M adaptively during the process. According to the Cayley–Hamilton theorem, A^{-1} can be expressed as a matrix polynomial of A of degree $m - 1$ with $m \leq n$:

$$A^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i A^i \quad (2)$$

with $A^0 = I$, the identity matrix, and c_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$, being certain constants.

Following [25], for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$, we shall use denote by $A^i(j, k)$ the entry of A^i in position (j, k) , where $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and set $\mathcal{J}_i^k = \{j | A^i(j, k) \neq 0\}$. For $l = 0, 1, \dots, l_{\max}$, define $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k = \cup_{i=0}^l \mathcal{J}_i^k$. Let $M = [\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \dots, \mathbf{m}_n]$ be an approximate inverse of A . BPSAI computes each $\mathbf{m}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, by solving the LS problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{m}_k(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k)} \|A(\cdot, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k) \mathbf{m}_k(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k) - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2, \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, l_{\max}, \quad (3)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the vector 2-norm and the matrix spectral norm and $\mathbf{e}_k$ is the k th column of the $n \times n$ identity matrix I . We exit and output $\mathbf{m}_k$ when the minimum in (3) is less than a prescribed tolerance ε or l exceeds $l_{\max}$. We comment that $\mathbf{m}_k(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k)$ can be updated from the available $\mathbf{m}_k(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k)$ very efficiently; see [25] for details. The BPSAI procedure is summarized as Algorithm 1, in which $\mathbf{a}_k^l$ denotes the k th column of A^l and $\mathbf{a}_k^0 = \mathbf{e}_k$. It is easily justified that if $l_{\max}$ steps are performed then the sparsity pattern of M is contained in that of $(I + A)^{l_{\max}}$.

It is shown in [25, Theorem 1] that if A is sparse *irregularly*, that is, there is at least one column of A whose number of nonzero entries is considerably more than the average number of nonzero entries per column, then M may become dense very quickly as l increases. However, when most entries of A^{-1} are small, those of M are expected to be small too and thus contribute very little to A^{-1} . Therefore, in order to control

Algorithm 1 The BPSAI procedure

For $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, compute $\mathbf{m}_k$:

1. Set $\mathbf{m}_k = 0, l = 0, \mathbf{a}_k^0 = \mathbf{e}_k$ and take $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_0^k = \{k\}$ as the initial sparsity pattern of $\mathbf{m}_k$. Choose an accuracy requirement ε and the maximum $l_{\max}$ of outer loops.
 2. Solve (3) for $\mathbf{m}_k$ and let $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$.
 3. **while** $\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 > \varepsilon$ and $l < l_{\max}$ **do**
 4. $\mathbf{a}_k^{l+1} = A\mathbf{a}_k^l$, and augment the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k$ by bringing in the indices of the nonzero entries in $\mathbf{a}_k^{l+1}$.
 5. $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k$.
 6. **if** $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset$ **then**
 7. Set $l = l + 1$, and go to 3;
 8. **end if**
 9. $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k \cup \hat{\mathcal{J}}$
 10. Solve (4) for updating $\mathbf{m}_k$ and $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$.
 11. If $\|\mathbf{r}_k\| \leq \varepsilon$, then break.
 12. Set $l = l + 1$
 13. **end while**
-

the sparsity of M and construct an effective preconditioner, we should apply dropping strategies to BPSAI. PSAI(tol) just serves this purpose. It aims to effectively determine an approximate sparsity pattern of A^{-1} and capture its large entries. At each while-loop in PSAI(tol), for the new available $\mathbf{m}_k$, small entries below a prescribed tolerance tol are dropped and only large ones are retained. We describe the PSAI(tol) algorithm as Algorithm 2, in which the sparsity pattern of $\mathbf{m}_k$ is denoted by $\mathcal{J}_l^k, l = 0, 1, \dots, l_{\max}$, which are updated according to steps 9–11 of Algorithm 2. Hence, for every k , we solve the LS problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{m}_k(\mathcal{J}_l^k)} \|A(\cdot, \mathcal{J}_l^k)\mathbf{m}_k(\mathcal{J}_l^k) - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2, \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (4)$$

Similar to BPSAI, $\mathbf{m}_k(\mathcal{J}_{l+1}^k)$ can be updated from the available $\mathbf{m}_k(\mathcal{J}_l^k)$ very efficiently.

From now on we denote by M the preconditioners generated by either BPSAI or PSAI(tol). How M is computed will be clear from the context. We will distinguish them by M and M_d , respectively when necessary. It is clear that we cannot guarantee the non-singularity of M if ε is not suitably small. For a general matrix M , define $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$ and $p = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{nnz(\mathbf{r}_k)\}$, where $nnz(\mathbf{r}_k)$ is the number of nonzero entries in $\mathbf{r}_k$. Grote and Huckle [19] have proved that if $\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 < \varepsilon$ and $\sqrt{p}\varepsilon < 1$ then M is nonsingular. This gives a criterion for choosing ε . As commented in [19], for SPAI, p is usually much smaller than n . This is also the case for BPSAI. However, we should realize that such a sufficient condition is very conservative, as pointed out in [19]. In practice, for a rather mildly small ε , say 0.3, M is rarely singular. Grote and Huckle [19] have estimated differences between M and A^{-1} in the spectral norm, the F-norm and the 1-norm. Their results are general and thus apply directly to BPSAI and PSAI(tol). So for BPSAI, the non-singularity and quality of M is determined by ε and $l_{\max}$, two parameters that control while-loop termination in Algorithm 1. On the one hand, a smaller ε will give rise to higher quality but generally denser preconditioner M . As a result, more computational cost and memory consumption is needed to construct M . It is also more expensive to apply M at each iteration of a Krylov solver. On the other hand, a bigger ε may generate

Algorithm 2 The PSAI(tol) Algorithm

For $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, compute $\mathbf{m}_k$:

1. Set $\mathbf{m}_k = 0, l = 0, \mathbf{a}_k^0 = \mathbf{e}_k$ and $\mathcal{S}_0^k = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_0^k = \{k\}$ as the initial sparsity pattern of $\mathbf{m}_k$. Choose an accuracy requirement ε , dropping tolerance tol and the maximum $l_{\max}$ of outer loops.
 2. Solve (4) for $\mathbf{m}_k$ and let $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$.
 3. **while** $\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 > \varepsilon$ and $l \leq l_{\max}$ **do**
 4. $\mathbf{a}_k^{l+1} = A\mathbf{a}_k^l$, and augment the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k$ by bringing in the indices of the nonzero entries in $\mathbf{a}_k^{l+1}$.
 5. $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l+1}^k \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_l^k$.
 6. **if** $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset$ **then**
 7. Set $l = l + 1$, and go to 3;
 8. **end if**
 9. $\mathcal{S}_{l+1}^k = \mathcal{S}_l^k \cup \hat{\mathcal{J}}$
 10. Solve (4) for $\mathbf{m}_k$ and compute $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$. If $\|\mathbf{r}_k\| \leq \varepsilon$, perform 11 and break.
 11. Drop the small entries in $\mathbf{m}_k$ whose sizes are below tol and delete the corresponding indices from $\mathcal{S}_{l+1}^k$.
 12. Set $l = l + 1$
 13. **end while**
-

a sparser but possibly poorer M , so that the Krylov solver may use more iterations to solve the preconditioned system and the preconditioner M may be ineffective. Unfortunately, selection of ε can only be empirical. As done usually in the literature, we will simply take it to be some fairly small quantities, say $0.2 \sim 0.4$, in numerical experiments.

3 Selection criteria for dropping tolerances

First of all, we should keep in mind that all SAI preconditioning procedures are based on the basic hypothesis that the majority of entries of A^{-1} is small, that is, there exist sparse approximate inverses of A . Mathematically, this amounts to supposing that there exists (at least) an M such that the residual $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon$ for a fairly small ε and some matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$, where M has many small entries. The size of ε measures the quality of M as an approximation to A^{-1} . The smaller it is, the better quality M has.

In the following discussions, we will assume that BPSAI produces an M satisfying $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon$ for some given small ε . We comment that this is definitely achieved for a suitable $l_{\max}$. Under this assumption, keep in mind that M may be relatively dense but have many small entries. PSAI(tol) aims at dynamically dropping those small entries below some given dropping tolerance tol as the process proceeds and computing a new sparser M , so as to reduce storage memory and computational cost of constructing and applying M as a preconditioner. We are concerned with two problems. The first problem is how to select tol to make M nonsingular. As will be seen, since tol varies dynamically for each k , $1 \leq k \leq n$, as l increases from 0 to $l_{\max}$ in Algorithm 2, we will instead denote it by tol_k when computing the k th column $\mathbf{m}_k$. The second is how to select tol_k 's to make M as sparse as possible and in the meantime its approximation quality comparable to that obtained by BPSAI in the sense that the residuals of two M 's are of the same order size. With such sparser M , it is expected that Krylov solvers applied to the linear systems

preconditioned by BPASI and PSAI(tol), respectively, will use comparable iterations to achieve the convergence. If so, PSAI(tol) will be considerably more effective than BPASI provided that M obtained by PSAI(tol) is considerably sparser than that by BPASI. As far as we are aware of, these important problems have never been studied rigorously and systematically in the context of SAI preconditioning. How to solve them and select tol_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ satisfying these two requirements is very significant and turns out nontrivial.

Over the years, dropping has been performed empirically in the literature. One commonly considers a dropping tolerance tol in the absolute sense: Set m_{jk} to be zero if their magnitudes are below some empirical tol , say 10^{-3} ; see, e.g. [15, 25, 34, 35]. Due to the absence of solid theory, doing so is problematic and may either miss important entries or retain too many superfluous ones if tol 's are chosen improperly.

For general purposes, we should take the size of $\mathbf{m}_k$ itself into account when dropping those small entries m_{jk} for $1 \leq j \leq n$ in $\mathbf{m}_k$. Define the vector $\mathbf{f}_k$ to be the n -dimensional vector whose nonzero entries $f_{jk} = m_{jk}$ are those to be dropped in $\mathbf{m}_k$. Precisely, we drop these m_{jk} 's in $\mathbf{m}_k$ when

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{f}_k\|}{\|\mathbf{m}_k\|} \leq \mu_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (5)$$

for some suitable norm $\|\cdot\|$, where μ_k is a certain small quantity that should be chosen carefully based on some solid theory. For carefully chosen μ_k 's, only using criterion (5) can we drop the truly relatively small entries in $\mathbf{m}_k$ and avoid dropping those significant entries when $\|\mathbf{m}_k\|$ is small or retaining those insignificant entries when $\|\mathbf{m}_k\|$ is large.

Next we establish a few results that play a vital role in selecting μ_k in (5) effectively. Unless stated otherwise, the matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$ denotes a general induced matrix norm, which includes the 1-norm, the infinity norm and the spectral norm.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon < 1$ for any induced matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$. Then M is nonsingular. Define $M_d = M - F$. If F satisfies*

$$\|F\| < \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\|A\|}, \quad (6)$$

then M_d is nonsingular.

Proof. Suppose that M is singular and let $\mathbf{w}$ with $\|\mathbf{w}\| = 1$ be an eigenvector associated with its zero eigenvalue(s), i.e., $M\mathbf{w} = 0$. Then for any induced matrix norm we have

$$\|AM - I\| \geq \|(AM - I)\mathbf{w}\| = \|\mathbf{w}\| = 1,$$

a contradiction to the assumption that $\|AM - I\| < 1$. So M is nonsingular.

Since

$$M_d = M - F = M(I - M^{-1}F), \quad (7)$$

from (6) we have

$$\|M^{-1}F\| \leq \|M^{-1}\|\|F\| < (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\|M^{-1}\|}{\|A\|}. \quad (8)$$

Since

$$\| \|A\| - \|M^{-1}\| \| \leq \|A - M^{-1}\| \leq \|AM - I\| \|M^{-1}\| \leq \varepsilon \|M^{-1}\|,$$

we get

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \|M^{-1}\| \leq \|A\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|M^{-1}\|,$$

which means

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\|A\|}{\|M^{-1}\|} \leq 1 + \varepsilon. \quad (9)$$

Substituting (9) into (8), we have

$$\|M^{-1}F\| < 1, \quad (10)$$

from which it follows that $I - M^{-1}F$ in (7) is nonsingular and so is M_d . $\square$

Now denote by M_d the sparse approximate inverse of A obtained by PSAI(tol). Then M_d aims to retain the large entries m_{ij} of M and drops those small entries m_{ij} in it. The small entries that are dropped, if any, are those nonzero entries in the matrix F . So, M_d is sparser than M , and the number of its nonzero entries is equal to that of M minus that of F . This theorem shows that for given ε and $l_{\max}$, we should select tol_k for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that (6) holds in order to ensure the non-singularity of M_d , provided that we get a nonsingular M from BPSAI; otherwise, M_d may be singular.

In order to get an M_d comparable to M as an approximation to A^{-1} , we need to impose further restrictions to F and ε , as indicated below.

Theorem 2. Assume that $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon < 1$. Then M is nonsingular. Let $M_d = M - F$. Then if

$$\|F\| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|}, \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\|A\|} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

M_d is nonsingular and

$$\|AM_d - I\| \leq \min\{1, 2\varepsilon\}. \quad (12)$$

Specifically, if $\varepsilon < 0.5$, then

$$\|F\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|}. \quad (13)$$

and

$$\|AM_d - I\| \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

Proof. The non-singularity of M is already proved in Theorem 1. Since F satisfying (11) must satisfies (6), the non-singularity of M_d follows from Theorem 1 directly. From $\|AM - I\| \leq \varepsilon$ and (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|AM_d - I\| &= \|AM - AF - I\| \leq \|AM - I\| + \|A\|\|F\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \min\{\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon\} = \min\{1, 2\varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

(13) and (14) are direct from (11) and (12), respectively. $\square$

In what follows we always assume that $\varepsilon < 0.5$, so that (13) is satisfied and the residual $\|AM_d - I\| < 1$.

It is known that M is a good approximation to A^{-1} for a small ε . This theorem tells us that if dropping tolerances tol_k 's make F satisfy (13) then the M_d and M have comparable residuals and are approximate inverses of A with comparable accuracy, provided that ε is fairly small. In this case, we claim that they possess similar preconditioning quality for a Krylov solver and it is expected that the Krylov solver preconditioned by M_d and M , respectively, use comparable iterations to achieve convergence, as will be confirmed by numerical experiments.

We now present a theorem under the assumption that $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\| \leq \varepsilon$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, which is just used as the stopping criterion in the PSAI and SPAI algorithms, etc. where the norm is the 2-norm.

Theorem 3. Let $M = [\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \dots, \mathbf{m}_n]$ satisfy $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\| \leq \varepsilon < 0.5$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and let $M_d = M - F = [\mathbf{m}_1^d, \mathbf{m}_2^d, \dots, \mathbf{m}_n^d]$ with $F = [\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n]$. If $\|\mathbf{f}_k\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then

$$\|A\mathbf{m}_k^d - \mathbf{e}_k\| \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (15)$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{r}_k = A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k$. Then from $\mathbf{m}_k^d = \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{f}_k$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\mathbf{m}_k^d - \mathbf{e}_k\| &= \|\mathbf{r}_k - A\mathbf{f}_k\| \leq \|\mathbf{r}_k\| + \|A\mathbf{f}_k\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \|A\mathbf{f}_k\| \leq \varepsilon + \|A\|\|\mathbf{f}_k\|, \end{aligned}$$

from which and the assumption it follows that (15) holds. $\square$

This theorem indicates that given $\varepsilon < 0.5$ and $l_{\max}$, if the while-loop in BPSAI terminates due to $\|\mathbf{r}_k\| \leq \varepsilon$ for all k and tol_k 's are selected such that (13) holds, then the corresponding columns of M_d and M are of the same order accuracy provided that ε is fairly small, so M_d and M are approximate inverses of A with comparable accuracy and are expected to have a similar preconditioning quality.

Theorems 2–3 are fundamental and relate the quality of M_d to that of M in terms of ε quantitatively and explicitly. They provide necessary ingredients for reasonably selecting μ_k 's to get a possibly much sparser preconditioner M_d that has a similar preconditioning quality to M . In what follows we present a detailed analysis and propose robust and effective selection criteria for dropping tolerances tol_k 's.

For given $l_{\max}$, suppose that BPSAI has already computed a nonsingular M that satisfies $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\| \leq \varepsilon < 0.5$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. The crucial point is to combine (5) with Theorems 2–3 in an organic and correct way. Based on (5) and (13), we require that

$$\|\mathbf{f}_k\| \leq \min \left\{ \mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|, \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|} \right\} \quad (16)$$

at every loop in PSAL(tol).

However, (16) itself does not tell us how to select μ_k and how to drop each small entry m_{jk} in $\mathbf{m}_k$. We need to give an insightful analysis on it. Notice that Theorems 1–3 hold for any induced matrix norm. For our purpose, it appears that the 1-norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ is a reasonable and practical choice since this norm enables us to unify (5) and the condition (13) both elegantly and practically by noting $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|\mathbf{f}_k\|_1 = \|F\|_1$. The spectral norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ is theoretically useable but it is expensive to compute $\|A\|_2$. However, the infinity norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ does not nicely fit into our use. The reason is that there is no elegant and sharp relationship between $\|\mathbf{f}_k\|_\infty$ in (5) and $\|F\|_\infty$ in the condition (13).

We first investigate the issue of how to choose $\mathbf{f}_k$ to make (16) hold. It suffices to drop m_{jk} , $1 \leq j \leq n$ in $\mathbf{m}_k$ as long as its size is no more than $\min\{\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1, \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|_1}\}$ divided by $nnz(\mathbf{f}_k)$. Since $nnz(\mathbf{f}_k)$ is not known a-priori, in practice we replace it by the currently available $nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)$ before dropping, which is an upper bound for $nnz(\mathbf{f}_k)$. Therefore, we can take adaptive dropping tolerances tol_k 's for entries m_{jk} 's as

$$tol_k = \frac{\min \left\{ \mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1, \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|_1} \right\}}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (17)$$

Next we go to our central concern and discuss how to relate μ_k and tol_k to ε . The two terms in the numerator of tol_k (17) have their own rights and play different roles,

and consequently no one can be ignored. $\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1$ itself is to drop small entries in M while $\frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|_1}$ is to guarantee the non-singularity of M and to make it have comparable preconditioning quality to M . Only considering the first term, as our experiments confirm in the next section, may deliver a poor and even (numerically) singular M_d if

$$\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1 > \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|_1} \text{ and } tol_k = \frac{\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)} \quad (18)$$

for some k , causing the ineffectiveness and even complete failure of preconditioning. On the other hand, if

$$\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1 < \frac{\varepsilon}{\|A\|_1} \text{ and } tol_k = \frac{\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (19)$$

the sparsity pattern of M_d is determined by μ_k . In this case, however, we must realize that the smaller μ_k is, the less sparse M_d is, but such μ_k does not improve the quality of M_d as a sparse approximate inverse. As a result, we must combine the two terms organically. As the above arguments show, the best and the most effective μ_k should make the two terms equal, that is, we should choose

$$\mu_k = \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1 \|A\|_1} \quad (20)$$

and

$$tol_k = \frac{\varepsilon}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k) \|A\|_1}. \quad (21)$$

Only in this way can we get an M_d that is as sparse as possible and has a similar preconditioning quality to M , thus making the construction and application of M_d as cheap as possible. We should note that μ_k and tol_k are varying parameters during the while-loop in Algorithm 2 as $nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)$ changes when l increases from 0 to $l_{\max}$ in the PSAI algorithms.

We comment that in the literature one usually uses a *fixed* dropping tolerances μ_k and tol_k , which are chosen empirically and heuristically without taking ε into consideration; see, e.g., [15, 25, 34, 35]. Our theory has indicated that the non-singularity of M_d and its preconditioning quality critically depend on selection of dropping tolerances and can be sensitive to them. If a dropping tolerance tol is fixed and is larger than tol_k in (21) for some k during the construction process of M_d , we have experimentally found that M_d 's obtained by PSAI(tol) can be *exactly singular in finite arithmetic*, resulting in complete failures of Krylov solvers. However, reducing tol by one order of magnitude yielded nonsingular and high quality M_d 's. These results demonstrate that improperly chosen small tol_k 's can indeed make preconditioning fail completely and the quality and effectiveness of M_d depends on tol_k 's crucially.

Since Theorems 1–3 hold for a generally given approximate inverse M of A and do not depend on a specific F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning procedure, our theory works for all the static F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning techniques. The difference and simplification is that, for a static SAI procedure, μ_k in (21) and tol_k are fixed for each k as $\mathbf{m}_k$ and $nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)$ are already determined a-priori before dropping is performed on M . Practically, after computing M by a static SAI procedure, we record $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\| = \varepsilon_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and compute the constants $nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then by (17) and (21) we drop m_{jk} whenever

$$|m_{jk}| \leq tol_k = \frac{\varepsilon_k}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k) \|A\|_1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (22)$$

In such a way, we get a new sparser approximate inverse M_d that has a similar preconditioning quality to the possibly much denser M obtained by the static SAI procedure without dropping. However, we should remind that, different from the adaptive $\text{PSAI}(tol)$ where small entries below tol_k 's are dropped immediately once they are generated during the while-loop of Algorithm 2, static SAI procedures perform sparsification only after they compute possibly much denser M 's than M_d 's. So static SAI preconditioning does not save the computational cost of M_d 's.

4 Numerical experiments

In this section we consider a number of real world problems coming from scientific and industrial applications, which are described in Table 1¹. We shall demonstrate the effectiveness of our selection criteria for dropping tolerances applied to $\text{PSAI}(tol)$ and three F-norm minimization based static SAI preconditioning procedures.

The numerical experiments are performed on an Intel(R) Core (TM)2Duo Quad CPU E8400 @ 3.00GHz processor with main memory 2 GB using Matlab 7.8.0 with the machine precision $\epsilon_{\text{mach}} = 2.22 \times 10^{-16}$ under the Linux operating system. We run all the algorithms in a sequential environment. It is observed that the construction of M 's is often very costly and dominates the whole cost. But it is amenable to parallelization of F-norm minimization based SAI procedures in a distributed parallel environment. Preconditioning is from the right except `pores_2`, for which we found that left preconditioning outperforms right one very considerably in our test. It appears that the rows of `pores_2`'s inverse can be approximated more effectively than its columns by $\text{PSAI}(tol)$. Krylov solvers employed are BiCGSTAB and the restarted GMRES(50) algorithms [1], and we use the codes from Matlab 7.8.0. We comment that if the output of iterations for the code `bicgstab.m` is k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$ and BiCGSTAB performs $2k$ matrix-vector products. The initial guess is always $x_0 = 0$, and the right-hand side b is formed by choosing the solution $x = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$. The stopping criterion is

$$\frac{\|b - Ax_m\|_2}{\|b\|_2} < 10^{-8}, \quad x_m = My_m, \quad (23)$$

where y_m is the approximate solution obtained by BiCGSTAB or GMRES(50) applied to the preconditioned linear system $AMy = b$.

In the experiments, we take different ε 's to control the quality of M and we always set $l_{\max} = 5$. Keep in mind that every while-loop of the $\text{PSAI}(tol)$ algorithms terminates when $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2 < \varepsilon$ or $l \geq l_{\max}$. In all the tables, nnz denotes the number of nonzeros of a test matrix; $iter_b$ and $iter_g$ stand for the iteration numbers of BiCGSTAB and GMRES(50), respectively; $spar = \frac{nnz(M)}{nnz(A)}$ denotes the sparsity of M relative to A ; $ptime$ and $stime$ are CPU timings (in second) of constructing M and of solving the preconditioned linear systems by iterative solvers, respectively. † indicates that convergence is not attained within 1000 iterations, $num-$ denotes the CPU time no more than num .

We test all the matrices listed in Table 1 and report the results in Tables 2–9. Before explaining the tables in details, we point out an important observation: Given $l_{\max} = 5$, for every $\varepsilon = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4$, we found that M 's and M_d 's obtained by BPSAI and $\text{PSAI}(tol)$

¹All of these matrices are from the Matrix Market of the National Institute of Standards and Technology at <http://math.nist.gov/MatrixMarket> or from the University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection at <http://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/sparse/matrices/>.

Table 1: The description of test matrices.

Matrix	n	nnz	Description
epbl	14734	95053	Plate-fin heat exchanger
fidap024	2283	48733	Computational fluid dynamics problem
fidap028	2603	77653	Computational fluid dynamics problem
fidap031	3909	115299	Computational fluid dynamics problem
fidap036	3079	53851	Computational fluid dynamics problem
nos3	960	8402	Biharmonic equation
nos6	675	1965	Poisson equation
orsreg_1	2205	14133	Oil reservoir simulation. Jacobian Matrix
orsirr_1	1030	6858	As ORSREG1, but unnecessary cells coalesced
orsirr_2	886	5970	As ORSIRR1, with further coarsening of grid
pores_2	1224	9613	Reservoir simulation
sherman1	1000	3750	Oil reservoir simulation $10 \times 10 \times 10$ grid
sherman2	1080	23094	Oil reservoir simulation $6 \times 6 \times 5$ grid
sherman3	5005	20033	Oil reservoir simulation $35 \times 11 \times 13$ grid
sherman4	1104	3786	Oil reservoir simulation $16 \times 23 \times 3$ grid
sherman5	3312	20793	Oil reservoir simulation $16 \times 23 \times 3$ grid

with tol_k defined by (21) or smaller indeed satisfy $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{m}_k^d - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2 \leq 2\varepsilon$ for almost all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, respectively. The same findings also go to the three static SAIs algorithms tested.

4.1 Results for PSAI(tol)

We shall illustrate that our selection criterion (22) for dropping tolerances are robust and effective for general purpose. After this, we present more test results for three more purposes. First, we show that if $tol_k < \frac{\varepsilon}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)\|\mathbf{A}\|_1}$ then we may get a much denser M_d . So smaller tol_k 's do not improve the quality of M_d essentially and rather causes the construction (and application) of M_d much more time consuming. Second, we show that smaller tol_k 's may not drop more entries for some examples. This also indicates that our criterion just defines correct dropping tolerances. Third, we show that if we set $tol_k > \frac{\varepsilon}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)\|\mathbf{A}\|_1}$ at some steps in the while-loop of Algorithm 2 then we may obtain a (numerically) singular M_d , causing the complete failure of preconditioning.

We summarize the results obtained by the two Krylov solvers with and without PSAI(tol) preconditioning in Table 2, where we take tol_k in (21) as dropping tolerances and $\varepsilon = 0.3$. $M = I$ means no preconditioning used. It is easy to see that two Krylov solvers are accelerated by PSAI(tol) preconditioning substantially, since the iteration numbers are reduced considerably, especially for sherman2. We observed that the whole solving time is dominated by p_{time} of constructing M and s_{time} is negligible in the serial computing environment. So we do not list s_{time} here.

Next we report experiments on three matrices orsirr_1, orsirr_2 and orsreg_1 by using PSAI(tol) with $\varepsilon = 0.2$ and a few tol_k 's smaller than that defined by (21) as dropping tolerances. Denoting by RHS the right hand side of (21), we take tol_k 's to be $RHS, RHS/100, RHS/1000$ and $RHS/10000$, respectively, and look into the effects of smaller tol_k 's on the quality and sparsity of M 's as well as computational costs. Table 3 reports the results, where $tol_k = 0$ recovers the generic BPSAI algorithm. First, it is seen that the two Krylov solvers preconditioned by PSAI(tol) with four given tol_k 's and BPSAI

Table 2: Convergence results for all the test problems: unpreconditioning ($M = I$) and PSAI(tol) procedure with $\varepsilon = 0.3, l_{\max} = 5$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

Matrix	$M = I$		PSAI(tol)			
	$iter_b$	$iter_g$	$spar$	$ptime$	$iter_b$	$iter_g$
epb1	433	†	1.17	40.18	170	408
fidap024	†	†	5.15	34.86	49	99
fidap028	†	†	5.40	109.33	66	199
fidap031	†	†	2.95	48.41	103	410
fidap036	†	†	2.48	12.28	69	116
nos3	213	†	1.63	1.34	72	140
nos6	†	†	0.94	0.22	36	37
orsirr_1	†	†	2.02	2.62	30	49
orsirr_2	†	†	2.44	2.35	28	47
orsreg_1	687	346	1.17	5.87	48	76
pores_2	†	†	7.40	5.41	39	53
sherman1	356	†	2.67	0.83	25	41
sherman2	†	†	2.76	4.70	4	7
sherman3	†	†	1.86	4.94	144	866
sherman4	101	377	1.25	0.39	36	49
sherman5	†	†	1.77	2.54	33	46

converged very fast and solved the problems very successfully, as shown by $iter_b$'s and $iter_g$'s. Second, it is observed that M 's obtained by PSAI(tol) with tol_k satisfying (21) are naturally the sparsest and they are much sparser than the corresponding counterparts obtained by the other three smaller tol_k 's, while M 's obtained by BPSAI are densest. For these three problems, M 's become denser and denser quickly as tol_k decreases. We see it is the cheapest to construct M 's with $tol_k = RHS$ and their preconditioning quality is comparable to those obtained by BPSAI. As a result, smaller tol_k 's do not improve the quality of M 's essentially and rather make M 's much denser and more time consuming to construct.

For all the other test problems in Table 1 except orsirr_1, orsirr_2 and orsreg_1, we have made numerical experiments in the same way as described above. We have found that the sparsity and preconditioning quality of M 's obtained by PSAI(tol) with four tol_k 's changes little. This means that our dropping criterion (21) exactly drops small entries in M 's perfectly and smaller tol_k 's do not help any. Together with Table 3, we can well claim that our dropping criteria are effective and robust and it is not necessary to take smaller tol_k 's in PSAI(tol).

We now test the behavior of M obtained by PSAI(tol) for improperly chosen dropping tolerances tol_k 's that seem small intuitively. We attempt to show that the larger tol_k 's satisfying (18) for some given seemingly small μ_k 's may produce (numerically) singular M 's. That is, we take μ_k such that

$$tol_k = \frac{\mu_k \|\mathbf{m}_k\|_1}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k)} > \frac{\varepsilon}{nnz(\mathbf{m}_k) \|A\|_1},$$

i.e., (18), at some steps in the while-loop of Algorithm 2, where the above lower bound is

Table 3: Effects of smaller tol_k for $PSAI(tol)$ with $\varepsilon = 0.2, l_{\max} = 5$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

		$tol_k = RHS$	$tol_k = \frac{RHS}{100}$	$tol_k = \frac{RHS}{1000}$	$tol_k = \frac{RHS}{10000}$	$tol_k = 0$
orsirr_1	<i>spar</i>	3.21	8.75	11.01	12.95	16.21
	<i>ptime</i>	3.82	5.58	6.27	6.95	5.90
	<i>iter_b, iter_g</i>	25, 40	17, 27	15, 26	15, 26	15, 26
	<i>stime</i> ($\times 0.1$)	0.3, 0.6	0.1, 0.3	0.1, 0.3	0.3, 0.4	0.2, 0.3
orsirr_2	<i>spar</i>	3.67	9.27	11.53	13.24	16.04
	<i>ptime</i>	3.37	4.79	5.54	6.02	4.63
	<i>iter_b, iter_g</i>	26, 39	16, 26	16, 25	15, 25	16, 25
	<i>stime</i> ($\times 0.1$)	0.2, 0.5	0.1, 0.4	0.2, 0.2	0.1, 0.2	0.1, 0.3
orsreg_1	<i>spar</i>	1.72	6.20	8.99	11.07	14.77
	<i>ptime</i>	8.10	11.13	14.07	17.27	16.84
	<i>iter_b, iter_g</i>	43, 69	20, 32	17, 30	17, 30	17, 30
	<i>stime</i> ($\times 0.1$)	0.6, 1.0	0.3, 0.8	0.5, 0.7	0.5, 0.6	0.3, 0.8

Table 4: Sensitivity of the quality of M 's to dropping tolerances tol_k 's

	nos6	sherman2
$\varepsilon = 0.2$	$\mu_k = 10^{-4}$	$\mu_k = 10^{-3}$
$\varepsilon = 0.3$	$\mu_k = 10^{-4}$	$\mu_k = 10^{-3}$
$\varepsilon = 0.4$	$\mu_k = 10^{-3}$	$\mu_k = 10^{-3}$

(a): Bad μ_k 's resulting in (numerically) singular M 's by $PSAI(tol)$. For nos6, $\text{condest}(M) \approx 10^{25}$ for $\varepsilon = 0.2, 0.3$, $\mu_k = 10^{-4}$. For the others, $\text{condest}(M) = INF$.

Matrix	ε	μ_k	<i>ptime</i>	<i>spar</i>	<i>iter_b</i>	<i>iter_g</i>
nos6	0.2	10^{-5}	0.64	2.72	22	27
	0.3	10^{-5}	0.24	0.93	34	38
	0.4	10^{-4}	0.23	0.54	51	47
sherman2	0.2	10^{-5}	6.66	2.73	11	15
	0.3	10^{-5}	4.59	2.25	11	15
	0.4	10^{-5}	3.72	2.03	11	17

(b): Good μ_k 's leading to effective M 's

just our dropping tolerance (21). We drop the entries whose sizes are below such improper tol_k for some given small μ_k 's. Table 4 (a) lists the parameters ε and μ_k that produce a (numerically) singular M in the sense of the Matlab function **condest**(M) = INF or extremely large, e.g., around 10^{25} . Table 4 (b) reports the convergence results that are obtained by reducing the each corresponding μ_k by one or two orders. Obviously, the one- or two-order reduction of μ_k results in very essential improvements on the effectiveness of the preconditioners M 's. It does not only deliver nonsingular M 's but also accelerates the convergence very considerably. These tests indicate that the non-singularity and quality of M_d obtained $PSAI(tol)$ can be very sensitive to tol_k .

Table 5: Sensitivity of the quality of M 's to fixed dropping tolerances tol 's

	nos3	nos6	orsirr_1	orsirr_2	orsreg_1	sherman5
tol	10^{-2}	10^{-6}	10^{-5}	10^{-5}	10^{-4}	10^{-2}

(a): Bad tol 's resulting in numerically singular M 's for $\varepsilon = 0.4$

Matrix	tol	$ptime$	$spar$	$iter_b$	$iter_g$
nos3	10^{-3}	0.58	0.16	122	845
nos6	10^{-7}	0.22	0.43	61	†
orsirr_1	10^{-6}	2.03	0.63	116	286
orsirr_2	10^{-6}	1.61	0.68	78	229
orsreg_1	10^{-5}	7.23	0.37	144	309
sherman5	10^{-3}	3.18	0.44	67	130

(b): Good tol 's leading to effective M 's for $\varepsilon = 0.4$.

Table 4 is on dynamically varying tol_k 's. We have also tested $PSAI(tol)$ for several fixed tol 's during the whole while-loop of Algorithm 2 with $\varepsilon = 0.4$. For a given and fixed tol , $PSAI(tol)$ drops the entries of M whose sizes are below tol . Table 5(a) lists the matrices with tol 's leading to (numerically) singular M 's for $\varepsilon = 0.4$. However, if we reduce tol by one order, the yielding preconditioners will perform very well; see Table 5(b) for details. Therefore, we can conclude that the non-singularity and acceleration quality of M 's can be sensitive to tol 's.

In summary, the quality of M is very sensitive to dropping tolerances, and our section criterion is fairly robust and effective for $PSAI(tol)$.

4.2 Results for three static SAI procedures

In this subsection, we test the three static F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning techniques with the patterns of $(I + A)^3$, $(I + |A| + |A^T|)^3 A^T$ and $(AA^T)^2 A^T$, respectively; see [22] for the effectiveness of these patterns. We are intended to show the effectiveness of dropping selection criterion (22) and exhibit the sensitiveness of the preconditioning quality of M to the fixed dropping tolerance. We first compute M by predetermining its pattern and solving n independent LS problems, and we then get a sparser M_d by dropping the small entries in M below the one defined by (22) or some tolerance given empirically.

We summarize the results in Tables 6–9, where $ptime$ includes the time for predetermination of the pattern of M , the computation of M and the sparsification of M . Table 6 lists the results obtained by the static SAI procedure with the pattern of $(I + A)^3$, where Table 6(a) lists the matrices with tol 's leading to (numerically) singular M 's and Table 6(b) exhibits excellent performance of M_d 's generated by the static SAI when reducing corresponding tol 's in Table 6 (a) by one order. Tables 7–9 show the results obtained by the three static SAI procedures with dropping criterion (22).

We observed that there are some columns whose residual norms $\|A\mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{e}_k\| = \varepsilon_k$ are very small (some are at the level of ϵ_{mach}). Therefore, to drop small elements as many as possible, we replace those ε_k 's below 0.1 by 0.1 in (22). It is seen that each M_d is much sparser than the corresponding M and it is less time consuming to solve the preconditioned

Table 6: Sensitivity of the quality of M_d 's to fixed tol 's for the static SAI procedure with the pattern of $(I + A)^3$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

	orsirr_1	orsirr_2	orsreg_1	pores_2	sherman5
tol	10^{-5}	10^{-5}	10^{-3}	10^{-6}	10^{-2}

(a): Bad tol 's resulting in numerically singular M 's

Matrix	tol	$ptime$	$spar$	$iter_b$	$iter_g$
orsirr_1	10^{-6}	1.63	1.82	33	50
orsirr_2	10^{-6}	1.31	2.69	32	48
orsreg_1	10^{-4}	4.09	0.91	45	74
pores_2	10^{-7}	3.10	2.47	62	158
sherman5	10^{-3}	11.79	1.55	24	34

(b): Good tol 's leading to effective M 's

linear systems. However, each M_d and the corresponding M have the same accelerating quality, and they make each Krylov solver use exactly the the same iterations when each test problem is preconditioned by M_d and M , respectively. These results demonstrate that our selection criterion (22) is very effective and robust. In addition, we notice from Table 9 that the pattern of $(A^T A)^2 A^T$ leads to considerably denser M and M_d and it is much more expensive to compute them, compared with the other two patterns. Therefore, this static SAI procedure is less effective than the other two ones.

5 Conclusions

Selection criteria for dropping tolerances are vital to SAI preconditioning. However, this important problem has received little attention and never been studied rigorously and systematically. For F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning, such criteria affect both the non-singularity of a preconditioner M and the quality and effectiveness of it. Improper dropping tolerances may produce (numerically) singular M 's, causing the complete failure of preconditioning. To develop a robust and effective PSai(tol) preconditioning procedure, we have carefully analyzed the effects of dropping tolerances on the non-singularity, quality and effectiveness of preconditioners. We have established some important and intimate relationships between them. Based on them, we have proposed robust and effective selection criteria for dropping tolerances that can make M 's as sparse as possible and simultaneously have similar accelerating quality to those obtained by BPSAI. The theory on selection criteria is of generality and is adapted to all the static F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning procedures. Numerical experiments have shown that our criteria work very well.

For general purpose and effectiveness, robust selection criteria for dropping tolerances also play a key role in other *adaptive* F-norm minimization based SAI preconditioning procedures, i.e., the SPAI algorithm, that uses dropping. Just like for PSai(tol), dropping criteria serve two purposes, one of which is to make an approximate inverse M as sparse

Table 7: Static SAI procedure with the pattern of $(I + A)^3$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

		<i>ptime</i>	<i>spar</i>	<i>iter_b</i>	<i>iter_g</i>	<i>stime_b</i>	<i>stime_g</i>
orsirr_1	M	1.78	8.36	29	45	0.03	0.08
	M_d		4.54	29	45	0.01	0.06
orsirr_2	M	1.56	8.62	30	44	0.02	0.04
	M_d		5.24	30	44	0.02	0.03
orsreg_1	M	4.69	7.53	28	51	0.04	0.09
	M_d		2.95	33	51	0.01	0.08
pores_2	M	3.00	9.25	52	118	0.09	0.14
	M_d		4.98	52	118	0.06	0.13
sherman5	M	13.69	8.39	22	31	0.04	0.05
	M_d		3.54	22	31	0.02	0.04

Table 8: Static SAI procedure with the pattern of $(I + |A| + |A^T|)^3 A^T$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

		<i>ptime</i>	<i>spar</i>	<i>iter_b</i>	<i>iter_g</i>	<i>stime_b</i>	<i>stime_g</i>
orsirr_1	M	6.00	16.41	18	28	0.03	0.04
	M_d		10.06	18	28	0.01	0.03
orsirr_2	M	5.11	17.03	18	28	0.02	0.05
	M_d		11.23	16	28	0.01	0.02
orsreg_1	M	15.77	14.03	19	34	0.05	0.06
	M_d		6.83	19	34	0.02	0.05
pores_2	M	13.48	18.42	26	38	0.05	0.07
	M_d		11.91	26	38	0.05	0.06
sherman5	M	54.19	14.94	16	23	0.06	0.06
	M_d		6.41	16	23	0.02	0.04

as possible and the other is to guarantee that its preconditioning quality is comparable to that obtained by the SAI preconditioning procedure without dropping. For factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditioning, such the AINV algorithm and the FSAI algorithm, dropping is equally important. For it, the non-singularity of the factorized M is guaranteed naturally but how to drop small entries is nontrivial and has not yet been studied systematically. All these are very significant and are being under consideration.

References

- [1] R. Barrett, M. Berry, T. Chan, J. Demmel, J. Donato, J. Dongarra, V. Eijkhout, R. Romine and H. A. van der Vorst. *Templates for the Solution of Linear Systems: Building Blocks for Iterative Methods*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1994.
- [2] M. W. Benson and P. O. Frederickson. Iterative solution of large sparse linear systems arising in certain multidimensional approximation problems, *Utilitas Mathematica*. 22 (1982): 127–140.

Table 9: Static SAI procedure with the pattern of $(A^T A)^2 A^T$. Note: when the iterations for BiCGSTAB are k , the dimension of Krylov subspace is $2k$.

		<i>ptime</i>	<i>spar</i>	<i>iter_b</i>	<i>iter_g</i>	<i>stime_b</i>	<i>stime_g</i>
orsirr_1	M	17.70	27.79	13	20	0.02	0.02
	M_d		18.39	13	20	0.01	0.02
orsirr_2	M	15.36	28.84	14	19	0.02	0.03
	M_d		20.26	14	19	0.02	0.02
orsreg_1	M	57.22	22.77	14	24	0.05	0.04
	M_d		12.75	14	24	0.02	0.04
pores_2	M	48.91	30.84	16	26	0.06	0.05
	M_d		19.46	16	26	0.05	0.04
sherman5	M	138.41	22.53	14	19	0.06	0.06
	M_d		9.09	14	19	0.02	0.03

- [3] M. Benzi. Preconditioning techniques for large linear systems: a survey. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 182 (2002): 418–477.
- [4] M. Benzi, C. D. Meyer and M. Tuma. A sparse approximate approximate inverse preconditioner for conjugate gradient method. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 17 (1996): 1135–1149.
- [5] M. Benzi and M. Tuma. A sparse approximate inverse preconditioner for nonsymmetric linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19 (1998): 968–994.
- [6] M. Benzi and M. Tuma. A comparative study of sparse approximate inverse preconditioners. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 30 (1999): 305–340.
- [7] L. Bergamaschi, G. Gambolati and G. Pini. A numerical experimental study of inverse preconditioning for the parallel iterative solution to 3D finite element flow equations. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 210 (2007): 64–70.
- [8] L. Bergamaschi, Á. Martínez and G. Pini. Parallel preconditioned conjugate gradient optimization of the Rayleigh quotient for the solution of sparse eigenproblems. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 175 (2006): 1694–1715.
- [9] M. Bollhöfer. A robust and efficient ILU that incorporates the growth of the inverse triangular factors. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 25 (2003): 86–103.
- [10] O. Bröker and M. J. Grote. Sparse approximate inverse smoothers for geometric and algebraic multigrid. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 41 (2002): 61–80.
- [11] O. Bröker, M. J. Grote, C. Mayer and A. Reusken. Robust parallel smoothing for multigrid via sparse approximate inverses. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 23 (2001): 1396–1417.
- [12] B. Carpentieri, I. S. Duff and L. Giraud. Sparse pattern selection strategies for robust Frobenius-norm minimization preconditioners in electromagnetism. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 7 (2000): 667–685.
- [13] E. Chow. A priori sparsity patterns for parallel sparse approximate inverse preconditioners. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 21 (2000): 1804–1822.
- [14] E. Chow and Y. Saad. Experimental study of ILU preconditioners for indefinite matrices. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 86 (1997): 387–414.
- [15] E. Chow and Y. Saad. Approximate inverse preconditioners via sparse-sparse iterations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19 (1998): 995–1023.

- [16] J. D. F. Cosgrove, J. C. Diaze and A. Griewank. Approximate inverse preconditionings for sparse linear systems. *International Journal of Computer Mathematics*, 44 (1992): 91–110.
- [17] M. Ferronato, G. Janna and G. Pini. Parallel solution to ill-conditioned FE geomechanical problems. *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, 36 (2012): 422–437.
- [18] N. M. Gould and J. A. Scott. Sparse approximate-inverse preconditioners using norm-minimization techniques. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19 (1998): 605–625.
- [19] M. J. Grote and T. Huckle. Parallel preconditioning with sparse approximate inverses. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 18 (1997): 838–853.
- [20] A. Gupta and T. George. Adaptive techniques for improving the performance of incomplete factorization preconditioning. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 32 (2010): 84–110.
- [21] R. M. Holland, A. J. Wathen and G. J. Shaw. Sparse approximate inverses and target matrices. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 26(2005): 1000–1011.
- [22] T. Huckle. Approximate sparsity patterns for the inverse of a matrix and preconditioning. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 30 (1999): 291–303.
- [23] C. Janna, M. Ferronato and G. Gambolati. A block FSAI-ILU parallel preconditioner for symmetric positive definite linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 32 (2010): 2468–2484.
- [24] C. Janna and M. Ferronato. Adaptive pattern research for Block FSAI preconditioning. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33 (2011): 3357–3380.
- [25] Z. Jia and B. Zhu. A power sparse approximate inverse preconditioning procedure for large sparse linear systems. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 16 (2009): 259–299.
- [26] I. E. Kaporin. A preconditioned conjugate gradient method for solving discrete analogs of differential problems. *Differential Equations*, 26 (1990): 897–906.
- [27] L. Y. Kolotilina. Explicit preconditioning of systems of linear algebraic equations with dense matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 43 (1988): 2566–2573.
- [28] L. Y. Kolotilina, A. A. Nikishin, and A. Y. Yeregin. Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditionings. IV: Simple approaches to rising efficiency. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 6 (1999): 515–531.
- [29] L. Y. Kolotilina and A. Y. Yeregin. Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditionings I. theory. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 14 (1993): 45–58.
- [30] J. Mayer. Alternative weighted dropping strategies for ILUTP. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 27 (2006): 1424–1437.
- [31] Y. Saad. ILUT: A dual threshold incomplete LU factorization. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 1 (1994): 387–402.
- [32] Y. Saad. *Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
- [33] W. P. Tang. Toward an effective sparse approximate inverse preconditioner. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 20 (1999): 970–986.
- [34] W. P. Tang and W. L. Wan. Sparse approximate inverse smoother for multigrid. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 21 (2000): 1236–1252.
- [35] K. Wang and J. Zhang. MSP: A class of parallel multistep successive sparse approximate inverse preconditioning strategies. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 24 (2003): 1141–1156.
- [36] G. Wittum. On the robustness of ILU smoothing. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 10 (1989): 699–717.